Remarks

The applicants respectfully request reconsideration and a determination that the claims of the captioned application are allowable.

1. The Office Action Summary indicated that "none of" the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in ancestor application Ser. No. 08/817,445. This must be a clerical error. Application Ser. No. 08/817,445 was a 35 USC §371 application, and the foreign priority documents were provided by the International Bureau. Copies of the following documents from the PTO's prosecution history file for Application Ser. No. 08/817,445 are enclosed: Table of Contents page showing priority papers as document no. 3; 16 June 1997 Notification of Acceptance Under 371 indicating that the priority documents have been received; priority document NZ 264,864 with a WIPO stamp showing receipt on 22 December 1995; and priority document NZ 272,778 with a WIPO stamp showing receipt on 22 December 1995. It is requested that the next office action confirm that all of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in application Ser. No. 08/817,445.

2. Claims 22-63 are pending in the captioned application.

The Office Action rejected all of the claims as not complying with the written description requirement under the first paragraph of 35 USC §112, and listed allegedly unsupported limitations of each of the independent claims.

The support for each limitation of each claim was previously submitted in accordance with 37 CFR §1.607(a)(5). The limitations mentioned in the Office Action are discussed below.

With regard to claim 22, the Office Action erroneously asserted there is no support for "with respect to cell coverage" in the limitation "a sensor for detecting a position of a down-tilt antenna with respect to cell coverage..." This is supported by the specification. *See e.g.* 6:29-32

("a plurality of such systems may be remotely controlled as part of a control strategy for a number of cellular base stations"); 18:10-12 ("the system can be integrated as part of a control strategy for a cellular base station"); 18:13-15 ("may adjust the downtilt of antennas at a cellular base station remotely to adjust the size of the cell in response to traffic demand"); 18:16-18 ("capability to continuously and remotely control the electrical downtilt of a number of antenna of a cellular base station"); 22:1-3 ("the present invention may find particular application in antenna systems, such as those used in cellular communication systems").

With regard to claim 22, the Office Action erroneously asserted there is no support for "an antenna controller communicating with said sensor," and erroneously asserted that there was no disclosure of signals changed by switch 43 being provided to controller 80. This is supported by the specification. *See e.g.* 13:13-16 ("Figure 7 shows how motor 41, reed switch 43 and switches 45 and 46 are connected to lines 71, 72, 76 and 77 from an external controller"); 14:4-9 ("lines 76 and 77 are connected to reed switch 43 so that the opening and closing of reed switch 43 may be monitored by an external control unit. In use, the opening and closing of reed switch 43 may be monitored to determine the position of threaded member 34, and hence the corresponding degree of tilt of the antenna"); Fig. 7 shows lines 71, 72, 76 and 77 corresponding to a cable group 78; Fig. 8 shows cable groups 78 connected to a controller 80; 15:1-9 (through cable groups 78, controller 80 can adjust the tilt of a plurality of antennas).

With regard to claims 31 and 38, the Office Action erroneously asserted there is no support for "a plurality of antenna controllers each communicating with corresponding sensors." This is supported by the specification. *See e.g.* 27:3-8 (original claim 21, "a plurality of antenna systems as claimed in any one of claims 14 to 20 located at a plurality of sites" – each with a controller); 26:20-24 (original claim 18, "antenna system as claimed in any one of claims 14-17

including means to monitor the degree of phase shift of a phase shifter of each antenna to determine the degree of downtilt of each antenna beam [i.e. information from corresponding sensor] and for supplying such information to the controller"); 26:4-9 (original claim 14, antenna system comprising a controller and one or more antenna – each with means for varying downtilt of the antenna beam); 6:18-23 (antenna system comprising a controller and one or more antenna – each with means for varying downtilt of the antenna beam).

With regard to claims 43 and 54, the Office Action erroneously asserted there is no support for "establishing a current position of said downtilt antenna by sending an antenna check command to said antenna controller." This is supported by the specification. For example, the main controller or "central controller 89 may be a computer, such as an IBM compatible PC...." 18:20-21. The "following information about each antenna is given" (19:8): "Current Angle: this is the actual degree of beam tilt of an antenna which is communicated from the controller to the PC at start-up" (19:14-17). This is the current position of the downtilt antenna. It is established at the main controller (i.e., PC with central controller 89) when it starts up. This necessarily requires and means that starting the program at the PC sends a signal (the "check command") to the antenna controller (80) that causes reporting back of the current angle ("current position") of the antenna.

With regard to claims 45 and 56, the Office Action erroneously asserted there is no support for "transmitting an antenna check command." In the context of each of the two claims, a user requests a system check, the main controller transmits "an antenna check command" to a particular antenna controller, and that antenna controller returns the position of a corresponding antenna. This is supported by the specification. For example, "when a user clicks on the mouse the following options may be selected" (19:23-25): "the controller may be instructed to measure

the actual angle of tilt of an antenna" (20:9-11). This is the claimed "transmitting an antenna check command from said main controller to an addressed one of said plurality of antenna controllers."

With regard to claims 46 and 57, the Office Action erroneously asserted there is no support for "transmitting a change tilt command." This is supported by the specification. For example, "New Value: by moving a pointer to the row of an antenna and clicking a button of a mouse the settings of an antenna may be varied. When a user clicks on the mouse the following options may be selected" (19:20-25): "a user may enter a new angle...to set the antenna to a new value" (20:3-5). This is being effected remotely by signals from the main controller (central controller 89) to an addressed antenna controller (80). 18:1-8. This is the claimed "transmitting a change tilt command."

With regard to claim 47, the Office Action erroneously asserted there is no support for "an antenna controller communicating with said sensor," and erroneously asserted that there was no disclosure of signals changed by switch 43 being provided to controller 80. This is supported by the specification. *See e.g.* 13:13-16 ("Figure 7 shows how motor 41, reed switch 43 and switches 45 and 46 are connected to lines 71, 72, 76 and 77 from an external controller"); 14:4-9 ("lines 76 and 77 are connected to reed switch 43 so that the opening and closing of reed switch 43 may be monitored by an external control unit. In use, the opening and closing of reed switch 43 may be monitored to determine the position of threaded member 34, and hence the corresponding degree of tilt of the antenna"); Fig. 7 shows lines 71, 72, 76 and 77 corresponding to a cable group 78; Fig. 8 shows cable groups 78 connected to a controller 80; 15:1-9 (through cable groups 78, controller 80 can adjust the tilt of a plurality of antennas).

With regard to claims 51 and 62, the Office Action erroneously asserted there is no support for "an antenna controller memory connected to said antenna controller." This is supported by the specification. *See e.g.* 17:6-7 ("the angle of downtilt for each antenna may be stored in memory of controller 80"); 17:11-14 ("controller 80 may include tables in memory containing the number of pulses from reed switch 43 that must be counted for threaded member 34 to achieve each desired degree of downtilt"). That is, the antenna controller includes an antenna controller memory.

With regard to claims 51 and 62, the Office Action erroneously asserted that there was no disclosure of signals changed by switch 43 being provided to controller 80. This is supported by the specification. *See e.g.* 13:13-16 ("Figure 7 shows how motor 41, reed switch 43 and switches 45 and 46 are connected to lines 71, 72, 76 and 77 from an external controller"); 14:4-9 ("lines 76 and 77 are connected to reed switch 43 so that the opening and closing of reed switch 43 may be monitored by an external control unit. In use, the opening and closing of reed switch 43 may be monitored to determine the position of threaded member 34, and hence the corresponding degree of tilt of the antenna"); Fig. 7 shows lines 71, 72, 76 and 77 corresponding to a cable group 78; Fig. 8 shows cable groups 78 connected to a controller 80; 15:1-9 (through cable groups 78, controller 80 can adjust the tilt of a plurality of antennas).

As discussed above, each of the claim limitations identified in the office action is disclosed in the specification. In fact, each is discussed expressly though not always using the identical language as the claim. Even if that were not so, *arguendo*, "the failure of the specification to specifically mention a limitation that later appears in the claims is not a fatal one when one skilled in the art would recognize upon reading the specification that the new language reflects what the specification shows has been invented." *All Dental Prodx LLC v. Advantage*

Dental Products Inc., 64 USPQ2d 1945, 1948 (Fed. Cir. 2002). The above discussion demonstrates that the specification shows that what was invented includes each of the limitations in issue.

The applicants submit that the claims are in condition for allowance, requests reconsideration and a determination that the claims are allowable. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of the captioned application, the applicants request the Examiner to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 12 August 2005

L. Friedman, Reg. No. 37,135

WELSH & KATZ, LTD.
120 South Riverside Plaza
22nd Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60606-3912
(312) 655-1500